Document 63, John Tanner, Idaho Falls, ID Page 1 of 1

HLW EIS Web Comments HLWFDEIS Web Site From: Tuesday, April 18, 2000 4:25 PM Sent: web@iason.com To: web_archive@jason.com Cc: HLW EIS Web Comment Subject: Name: John Tanner Affiliation: Address1: 2175 Tasman Av. City, State Zip: Idaho Falls, ID 83404 Telephone: 208-529-5605 Date Entered: {ts '2000-04-18 16:25:28'} Tappreciate having had the comment period extended. Why has DOE not given serious consideration to other methods of calcining the sodium bearing waste, such as use of sugar to reduce the nitrate? I sense that we are going to lose the Calciner because of failure to develop an intelligent method of employing it. 63-2 [1] . (2) [1] agree with the National Research Council that processing of existing calcine should have a low priority.] 63-3 The DOE has biased the selection of methods by arbitrarily defining a metric ton of heavy metal as equal to two "canisters". This definition has no relation to the real limit in disposal density inside a repository, which is heat load, i.e. radioactivity. The result is to bias the economic analysis against high volume waste forms which might otherwise be desirable. One example is grouting of calcine, in case it is some day decided to treat the calcine. 63-4 111.F.2(1)

Document 64, Margaret Macdonald Steward, Ketchum, ID Page 1 of 2



EIS PROJECT - AR PF

IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE & FACILITIES DISPOSITION DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC COMMENT APRIL 19, 2000

Thomas Wichmann, Document Manager US DOE, Idaho Operations Office 850 Energy Drive, MS 1108 Idaho Falls, ID 83401-1563

Attention: Public Comment: Idaho HLW & FD DEIS

PUBLIC COMMENT FROM: MARGARET MACDONALD STEWART
PO BOX 2404
KETCHUM, ID 83340

Having lived for nearly 30 years in Blaine County, Idaho, I am, and have been for decades, very concerned by activities at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. With alarming frequency, these activities, particularly those dealing with radioactive waste treatment and storage, are rarely based with protection of human health and the environment as the primary concern.

If we are to ever get the mess of nuclear waste and contamination at the government's finctear weapons and storage facilities under some sort of reasonable control, we must begin to deal with the mess in a logical and rational manner. This must be done with a concerted effort by the Department of Energy to fully engage - and listen to - its most important business partner - the public. Had this business partner been involved from the get-go, this nation would not be in the critical situation we find ourselves in today. People who live and work in the shadow of nuclear facilities have an uncanny ability to know what is going right, and what is going terribly wrong. They know when they are being lied to and they know how to best rectify a project that is terribly misguided. Enough said. Don't forget to listen to us. We have a voice and we will use it en mass to get this situation reversed to start protecting us and the world we depend on for survival.

The Idaho HLW & FD DEIS is a complicated mass of options in how to deal with INEEL's deadly high-level waste problem. There is really no good option currently available to correct the damage that has been done by this waste and by the future damage it will cause. Each option presented has its own pitfalls. However, it is clear that with any reasonable thought going into the possible processes, ANY TREATMENT METHOD CHOSEN MUST HAVE AS ITS # 1 GUIDELINE PROTECTION OF HUMAN HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT. Anything less, is completely unacceptable. 64-14

 $[0] \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow \\ \text{To base a treatment program on an uncertain target - a non-existent permanent geologic repository - is sheer idiocy. We have waste. We have no where to dispose of it other than the site where it is right now. We must be realistic and not dwell on an over-the-$

- New Information

Appendix

D